SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS.

1. Rs. 1,029 under '8—Matches—Establishment'.

Mr. P. J. George *(Officiating Commissioner of Excise).*—Sir, I rise to move the House for an additional allotment of Rs. 1029 under the head Matches-Establishment. The amount is required for meeting the cost of the temporary additional staff sanctioned by the Government (G. P. F2-11698-12) for the administration of the Matches (Excise Duty) Regulation.

The Cochin Rules are only an adaptation of the British Match Rules. To have uniformity, it was found necessary to introduce similar rules in the State Factories too. The Bonded Warehouse Rules were passed by the Government with effect from 24th August 1936—9th Chingam 1112.

By the time the rules were passed and the revised staff was sanctioned, the Departmental Budget for the current year was already sent. It was not therefore possible to anticipate and make provision for this extra expenditure. Therefore there is no provision in the sanctioned Budget for this extra expenditure; nor is it possible to transfer any amount from any of the other heads for this purpose.

There is only a budget provision of Rs. 5380 for the above purpose in the current year's budget. A balance of Rs. 1029 is required to meet the expenditure of the year on account of the enhanced staff. According to the arrangements proposed by the Government of India in connection with the levy of Excise Duty on matches in the State and accepted by the Government, the State is to have all costs on this account met out of the gross receipts by the sale of banderols, at the time of the final allocation of the proceeds. There is thus no expenditure to be incurred from the general revenues of the Sirkar on this account.

I request that the House may be pleased to grant this additional allotment of Rs. 1029 under Matches-Establishment charges.

Mr. President.—A number of cut motions have been received on the various items. They were handed over only to-day.

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar *(Urakam)*—It was sent by me on the 15th. I got notice of these motions only on the 12th or 13th. As soon as I received them, I thought over them and

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

sent these cut motions. I think that on account of the holidays there was some difficulty.

Mr. President.—That is condoned. But I remember to have given a ruling that on supplementary demands you cannot have token motions to raise questions of policy. Your very first motion is that this amount be reduced by rupee one to discuss the policy of appointing and creating new posts before orders are passed on the report of the Retrenchment Committee. It has been clearly held that a motion like this is not in order.

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar *(Urakam)*.—It is not exactly on a question of policy that I raise the discussion. This demand involves the asking for an amount for posts that have been created recently and which have not been contemplated at the time of the budget. What I want is to draw the attention of the Government to the undesirability of creating posts when a Committee is sitting to see whether retrenchments can be effected. I do not think it will fundamentally depart from the rule which says that the subject discussed should be very relevant to the purpose for which the grant is asked for.

Mr. President.—The Hon'ble Member will have no difficulty in doing that. But if this cut motion is allowed, it leads to a discussion on the policy of Government of making appointments when a retrenchment committee is sitting. Obviously the Hon'ble Member will agree with me that general questions of policy cannot be discussed on any cut motion. What he wants to bring to the notice of Government is not to make such appointments when the committee is sitting. He can do it. But it must be noted by Hon'ble Members that we have to follow an established procedure. It can only be to discuss the financial merits of the proposal. For example, instead of having two officers you can say that only one is necessary and that instead of spending 1000 rupees, spend only 800. You cannot raise general questions of policy in supplementary demands. That is a well-established procedure in all legislatures. There is a ruling here also. That does not in the least curtail the powers of Honourable Members who should at the same time remember that they should not make a full dressed discussion on the subject. Certainly they can draw the attention of Government to any facts.

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar *(Urakam)*.—In fact I have spoken on it already and I have not much to add. I find

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

some recent appointments made just after or just before the passing of orders appointing a retrenchment committee. As an instance I can point out one—the case of the appointment of the Assistant Superintendents of Police. I think that order was published in the Gazette along with the orders appointing the Committee. Matters like that could well have been allowed to wait until the findings of this committee have been known. The creation of the post referred to by me, namely, that of A. S. Ps. takes place at a time when the Travancore Government is thinking of abolishing it. I hope that the Government will wait till orders are passed on the recommendations of the retrenchment committee to make any new appointment or create new posts.

Mr. President.—This expenditure is to be paid by the Government of India and not by us.

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar *(Urakam).*—Sir, I have nothing to say with regard to the merits of this particular appointment.

Mr. T. S. Narayana Ayyar *(Secretary to Government).*—This rule is observed in the case of new appointments. As regards the appointments referred to by the Hon'ble Member he has himself put a question which is being answered. As a matter of fact, the scheme sanctioning the creation of the posts of two Assistant Superintendents of Police was sanctioned long before the constitution of the Retrenchment Committee.

Demand was put and carried.

2. Rs. 2,625 under 'II—Forest—A 4—b'.

Mr. T. Narayana Menon *(Conservator of Forests).*—Sir, I rise to move for a supplementary grant of Rs. 2,625 under 11 Forests A—4—b. It is considered desirable to resume the elephant capturing operations in the State Forests which had been suspended since 1108. I request that the House may be pleased to grant this allotment.

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar *(Urakam).*—I had sent a cut motion just to know whether this proposal will be a financially successful one.

Mr. President—There is no cut motion on this.

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar *(Urakam).*—Anyhow I may be given the information whether the proposal to capture elephants will be a commercially successful one and whether that aspect of the matter has been considered by the Government. If I

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly